UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Is Outlawry A Utopian Dream?

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Justice to Asia

By DOREMUS SCUDDER

At the Grave of Morel

By HARRY FOSTER BURNS

VOLUME XCVI NUMBER 11

Chicago, November 30, 1925

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) .....

Address .....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 163
Is Outlawry A Utopian Dream? — JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 165
Jottings.—J. H. H. 167

ARTICLES—
A Chinese Creed.—*Young India* 163
Justice to Asia.—DOREMUS SCUDDER 168
At the Grave of Morel.—REV. HARRY FOSTER BURNS 171

POETRY—
Annecy.—G. F. S. 172
Schumann, OP. 12. No. 3. — JAMES WALDO FAWCETT 173
Answer.—*Hugh Robert Orr* 173
Anita Whitney.——*Robert Whitaker* 175

THE STUDY TABLE—
Some New Books.—FREDERICK STARR 172

CORRESPONDENCE—
Back to Barbarism.—DAVID GITTLEMAN 174

THE FIELD—
Should She Go to San Quentin.—*American Civil Liberties Union* 175
More Items of News from Archangelskoye.—DONALD STEPHENS 175

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1925 NUMBER 11

A CHINESE CREED

I believe in the deep blue sky and the smiling water.

I can see through the clouds of the sky and I am not afraid of the waves of the sea.

I believe in the living friendship given by flowers and trees: outwardly they die, but in the heart they live for ever.

Little paths through the green woods I love, and the sound of leaves falling on the ground, or of a nut falling, or even of a breaking twig.

I believe that the days to come already feel the wonder of the days that have passed, and will permit that wonder to endure and increase.

I believe in and love my belief in and my love for all these things: and most of all I believe in and love the source of my belief and my love.

—*Young India.*

"Friends, Romans, countrymen," cried Mark Antony! Friends, Americans, fellow-subscribers, cry we! You lend us your ears generously week after week. Not your ears only but your hearts as well, as letters and messages bring constant evidence. But we want more, now, than ears or even hearts. We want feet, and hands, and tongues, and pocket-books. We want you to be our agents, in other words, in a campaign till Christmas-time for new subscribers. We want you to use your feet in walking to the home or office of a friend; your hands in handing him a sample copy of UNITY; your tongue in asking him to subscribe; your pocket-book in matching his subscription with a new gift subscription of your own. If all our subscribers did this, our list of subscribers would be increased three-fold, and we could at once increase our paper from sixteen to twenty-four pages. Why not, dear friends?—Give us your help!

We have seen no mention in this country of what is in many ways the most remarkable and surely the most hopeful statement in the Locarno agreements. We refer to the sentence in the preamble, which could not have been set down by accident, which explains that the signatories were taking certain action because they were "anxious to satisfy the desire for security and protection which *animates the peoples upon whom fell the scourge of the war 1914-1918* (*les nations qui ont eu à subir le fleau de la guerre*)." It was not thus that the Treaty of Versailles spoke of the war. There was no grouping together in that infamous document of "the peoples upon whom fell the scourge," but a clear differentiation between the Allies who suffered the "scourge" and the Germans who wielded it. The Versailles Treaty, in other words, was all built upon the idea that the Germans were guilty of the war, and must be punished for their unexampled crime. At Locarno, however, all this was forgotten, or ignored. The Germans raised the question of war-guilt, to be sure, and the English and French refused to discuss it—most unfortunately, for the aftermath of the war will never finally be cleared away until the Versailles indictment of Germany has been explicitly repudiated and thrown away. But it is obvious that the French and English avoided the question not because they still believed the Germans guilty, but because they were in a mood to save their faces rather than to serve the truth. At any rate, when they came to set down the conditions of the new accord with Germany, they said nothing about guilt, but spoke only of the common disaster which "fell upon" all "peoples," and which these "peoples" had to endure together. This puts the war for the first time where it belongs—not a crime upon the back of Germany, but a catastrophe upon the back of all Europeans. We count this a happy augury, as marking the end of the indefensible propaganda against Germany, and the beginning of a true assessment of mutual responsibility.

We have said the best that could be said, in recent issues of this paper, about the Locarno treaties. So desperate is the condition of the world, that we are tempted almost to ecstasy by any signs of a changing mind and method in European affairs. It is wise to recognize, however, lest we be fooled again, that the treaties are far from perfect, and that their imperfections may well be the cause of one more failure in the work for peace. We have already spoken of the dreadful peril involved in the provision for armed sanctions. Military guarantees of security are the old method which has invariably meant in the past not peace but war. In addition, the treaties themselves make no specific reference to disarmament. They prepare the way, but it still remains to be seen if the nations will walk in this way. Again, the treaties do nothing to abolish the Council of Ambassadors, an irresponsible body exercising powers which have no place in a peaceful world. Still again, the question of Allied occupation of German soil remains untouched, although there are encouraging signs that this iniquity is to be speedily cleared up, in part at least, as a guarantee to skeptical German opinion of Allied sincerity and goodwill. Lastly, and most serious, there is the question of Russia! To quote *Foreign Affairs* (London), "will the Allies endeavor to enter into cordial relations with Russia, so as to reassure the world that this partial treaty is not intended as the beginning of a Western Alliance against an Eastern Alliance?" Declarations to this effect were

made at Locarno, but when were the words of diplomats to be accepted as truth? Until and unless there comes a change of attitude toward Russia, the Locarno treaties must rest under the dread suspicion of constituting an alliance of western Europe against the Soviets, and of thus being only the latest chapter in the melancholy history of balances of power.

We have tried our best to convince ourselves that the text of the alleged secret treaty between Soviet Russia and Italy, as published in the New York *World*, is a "fake." It certainly fits in with all that we know about Mussolini's Italy, but it fits in not at all with what we know or hope about the Bolshevik republic. If this treaty is genuine, then Russia is not the nation that we think she is. For what are the Soviets doing with *secret* treaties—they who published the secret treaties of the Allies and thus did more to establish the truth about the war than any other single agency? Why should the Soviets strike bargains with the Fascisti on any subject or to any ends? What do the Soviets mean about having "perfectly free hands" in the Balkans and in Roumania? How can the Soviets agree to send Russian troops against Turkey in the event of an Italo-Turkish war? All this is in the very best tradition of European imperialistic diplomacy, but wholly out of tune with all that the Bolsheviki have done in foreign affairs since they took control in 1917. We have examined the document, as published, to find evidences of forgery, but we have to confess that it looks distressingly *bona fide*. We have searched the newspapers to discover a sweeping denial from Moscow, but we have not seen a word. Yet we still hope on, for we know that it is still a fact that the chances of a tale like this being true are infinitely less than the chances of its being untrue. The judgment of the New York *Nation* on the significance of the alleged treaty is unanswerable:

> If this is a reliable document, it must constitute a serious blow to the Russians' contention of being opposed to imperialistic gains by force and to that of being engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the capitalist civilizations surrounding them.

> Who shall decide when doctors disagree?

asks Alexander Pope. Who indeed? Certainly not UNITY, which pretends to no infallible knowledge on any subject. But we can at least state the disagreement and ask what it means, and this we would now do in the most interesting disagreement between "doctors" that we have seen for a long time. Some weeks ago Professor Thomas N. Carver, of Harvard, published a book entitled "The Present Economic Revolution in the United States." This is one prolonged ululation over the blessings of capitalism in this best of all countries in this best of all possible worlds. Dr. Carver declares that Socialism is bankrupt, that all its prophecies of the collapse of capitalism are discredited, that capitalism is stronger than ever, and that its benefits are so abundant and so universally diffused that the ideal society is already close at hand. The "revolution" to which he refers is the ending of the nineteenth century division between capital and labor, and the resulting union of the two classes in the control and enjoyment of industrial wealth. Capitalists are now laborers, and laborers are fast becoming capitalists. His proof for this latter point he finds in various developments, such as labor banks, etc., but more particularly in the ever-widening diffusion of ownership of corporate securities among working-people and the public generally. Here is the basis of the coming Utopia, and the vindication of the whole capitalistic system of industry. Thus Professor Carver! Now comes at this same time a colleague of Professor Carver at Harvard, Professor Ripley, who reads a paper before a meeting of the Academy of Political Sciences in New York. He (Ripley) sees the same facts that Professor Carver sees, especially the diffusion of corporate ownership, and draws radically different conclusions. Diffusion of ownership, says Professor Ripley, means the development of financial control and production management not directly responsible to that ownership. This means "absentee ownership," with the inevitable dangers inherent in the combination of power and irresponsibility thus brought about. The situation pictured, in other words, is the already familiar one of one-time private business, directed and managed by the owner, now bought up by bankers, financed by wide selling or distribution of non-voting stock, with the net result, to quote Professor Ripley of "irresponsible control by intermediaries—mostly bankers, so-called—in place of the former responsibility for direction which . . . rested upon the shoulders of the actual owners." Which is exactly that concentration of wealth and power which the Socialists have prophesied from the beginning. What Professor Carver sees as the closed door of triumphant capitalism Professor Ripley sees as the open door to the inevitable socialist commonwealth! Our opinion on a technical question of this kind is not worth much, but our impression is that Professor Carver is superficial and doctrinaire, and has been shown up as such by his more scientific colleague.

The attitude of many of the respectable citizens of this country toward our national government is a confusing one. On the one hand they regard this government as a kind of "Ark of the Covenant," not to be profaned or even touched at peril of death. Radicals of all hues from the lightest pink to the darkest red are anathema on the ground that they are seeking the overthrow of this government. Even liberals are denounced because they desire to make a few changes in the system. Indeed the government has become so sacrosanct today, that even such a mild reform as the child labor amendment becomes impossible. Apparently there is nothing quite so perfect upon this earth as the government of the United States! On the other hand, however, from a quite different point of view, this govern-

ment appears to many of our citizens to be the last word in inefficiency, corruption and general all-round wickedness. Just get some stand-patter to tell you what he thinks about the Post Office, or public ownership of railroads, or the management of the war, or the regulation of private business by federal officials, and he at once flies into a passion of denouncement which outdoes the maddest tirades of the Moscow Bolsheviks. There is apparently nothing too bad to say about Washington and all its works. Such a two-headed attitude as this seems to us to indicate strange confusion of mind to say the least. Either our government is good and thus ought to be entrusted with increasing powers of administration and public control, or else it is bad and ought to be destroyed, made over, or not trusted at all. It must be one thing or the other; it cannot be both. We recommend to our conservative brethren that they sit down quietly by themselves and make up their minds as to what they really think about the government of the U. S. A.

Are Modernists Liberals? We think not! As we look at the religious world to-day, we see three perfectly distinct groups—Fundamentalists, Modernists and Liberals—and of these the Modernists are much nearer to the first than they are to the last. Thus, the Fundamentalist may be described as one who is striving to preserve the old faith at any cost to intelligence, knowledge and the charitable spirit. The old is the ever true, because revealed in the beginning out of the mind of God. If science disagrees with it, so much the worse for science. The old stands firm—or will stand firm if not deserted in the face of the enemy. Now the Modernist also is one who is striving to preserve the old doctrines and standards of the faith. He differs from the Fundamentalist in the fact that he is intelligent enough and well-educated enough to know that the old can be preserved at any one time only by adjusting it satisfactorily to the new. The Modernist knows that the law of survival is the law of adjustment or adaptation. He is therefore interested in this process of adjustment, but always to the end not of discovering or vindicating the new, but of preserving the old. He is thus, in his spirit and ultimate purpose, identical with the Fundamentalist. The Liberal, in contrast both to Fundamentalist and Modernist, may be described as one who is not a particle interested in the old as such. He is not especially concerned, for that matter, with the new as such. He sees no essential sanctity either in antiquity or novelty. His one interest is *the truth,* whatsoever it may be, howsoever it may be discovered, wheresoever it may lead. The Liberal simply wants to know reality, in so far as man can lay hold upon reality, and possessing it he wants to serve it unto the end. The Liberal, therefore, is always outside the established orthodox churches, since his objective is utterly apart from these churches. The Modernist is characteristically enough inside the established orthodox churches, since his purpose, in spite of all the bitter controversies, is at bottom identical with these churches. The Modernist is thus no Liberal. Yet is the Liberal a Modernist!—*a Modernist who has the full courage of his knowledge and conviction on the Fundamentals of the religious life.*

Is Outlawry A Utopian Dream?

When every other argument against the Outlawry of War program has failed, as they are bound to fail, one final argument remains as a kind of refuge for the distressed. Into this "last ditch" all the opponents of Outlawry sooner or later tumble, and there they rest in vast complacency as though in a fortress which is impregnable.

The argument to which we refer is, of course, the argument of Utopianism. The program for the Outlawry of War is all very fine—so this argument runs!—but it is Utopian, Quixotic. The idea of declaring war a crime and banishing it as such from the social order may be something that our children's children of the *nth* generation may be willing to adopt, but it has no feasibility at the present moment. In the present condition of the world, the Outlawry of War is utterly impracticable. We want to get rid of war to-day. We want a pacifist program which offers some sure promise of success not nine hundred and ninety-nine years from now, but right here at the present moment. We haven't got any time to wait or waste in this terrific business of finding the ways and means of durable peace among the nations. Any program, to have our support, must be not so much perfectly idealistic as immediately practicable. So these critics turn away from Outlawry and, of all things in the world, put their trust in such institutions as the World Court and the League of Nations!

The obvious reply, of course, to make to this complaint is to point out that, in presenting such an argument, these anti-Outlawry pacifists are joining the ranks of the militarists with a vengeance. What is this whole argument of impracticality but exactly the argument which the militarists have presented, and still are presenting, against every program of peace that the world has ever seen? The same indictment of Utopianism which the anti-Outlawry people level against the Levinson-Borah proposition, the generals and admirals enthusiastically level against the World Court, the League of Nations, the Geneva Protocol, even the security pacts. The whole peace movement, say these sons of Mars, is a foolish dream. War is here! It always *has* been here, and always *will* be here! Human nature

is human nature—selfish, aggressive, combative, violent! The political order is based on nationalistic rivalry, as the economic order is based on the grim, brute struggle for existence! Why not face the situation as it is, and prepare for its inevitable and unescapable contingencies? All of which means that the Outlawry of War only shares with all other peace plans the charge of impracticality, so far as the thorough-going practical mind is concerned! The peace people, after all, are engaged in the business of ideals, and the sooner they recognize this, and have the courage of their highest as well as their lowest ideals, the better.

But it is not our intention in this brief article, to discuss these general aspects of the venerable philosophical antinomy of idealism and realism. Our question at this moment is the very specific question as to whether the Outlawry of War, as an immediate program for the peace movement of the world, is Utopian. Is it true that its practical fulfilment is impossible to-day—that such fulfilment must wait upon the passing of decades, generations, centuries? If it is true, of course, the fact is fatal, for time *is* pressing, and we must seek the shortest, if not the surest, pathway to our goal.

In arguing the impracticable character of the Outlawry of War program, its opponents usually refer by way of illustration to that particular item of the program which calls for the recodification of international law on the basis of war as a crime. Recodify international law, cry these feeble-hearted folk? Why, you couldn't do this in a hundred years. Furthermore, international law is not something artificially made. It is something that organically grows. You are talking nonsense here as well as Utopianism!

All this sounds plausible as a theory. The only trouble is that, as with so many theories, it happens not to be true! On this very point of the codification of international law, such is the irony of circumstance and the kindness of Providence, we have the data to *prove* that it is not true. Right before our face and eyes at this moment is the laboratory demonstration of the fact that the Outlawry of War is the most feasible proposition imaginable. It is not only something that *can* be done tomorrow—it is actually something that *is being done* to-day. Let us have a little history!

On January 2, 1924, the governing board of the Pan-American Union adopted an official resolution suggesting to the executive committee of the American Institute of International Law that the Institute "should hold a session within the current year (1924) in order that its deliberations on the codification of international law should be submitted to the International Committee of Jurists to meet at Rio de Janeiro in the ensuing year (1925)."

The American Institute of International Law acted favorably upon this suggestion of the Pan-American Union on January 9, 1924. Eleven months later, December 20-31, a special meeting of members of the Institute was held at Lima, Peru, "for the purpose of considering the question of codification"; and the result was a series of "projects, or draft conventions," thirty (30) in number, covering a wide range of subjects running all the way from "recognition of nations," "national domain," "immigration," "extradition," etc. to "maritime neutrality," "measures of repression" and "conquests."

These drafts or conventions, expressly described as a "*codification* of American International Law," were transmitted to Secretary of State Charles E. Hughes, by letter of James Brown Scott, President of the American Institute of International Law, and a member of the Codification Committee, on March 2, 1925; and on this same date were transmitted by Mr. Hughes, as Chairman of the governing board of the Pan-American Union, to the Union itself for submission to the commission of jurists to meet at Rio de Janeiro this present year.

The *first* thing to be said about this remarkable document, printed and now available in a Pan-American Union pamphlet, is that it presents a successful codification of international law for nations occupying one entire hemisphere of the globe.

The *second* thing to be noted is that this codification was suggested, attempted and *completed* in a period of exactly fourteen (14) months.

The *third* thing to be noted and emphasized is that this codification of American international law represents a complete break with all previous international law—a right-about-face in the whole process of international relations—in that it is based on the concept not of war but of *peace!* Said Secretary Hughes, in his remarks transmitting the new code to the Union (see pamphlet, page 3):

> It is significant that the executive committee of the American Institute of International Law has stated that their projects relate to the international law of peace. Their members were a unit in believing that the law of war should find no place in the relations of the American Republics. We have dedicated ourselves to the cause of peace.

Referring to this same point, in his letter of transmission to the Secretary of State, Mr. James Brown Scott said (see pamphlet, page 6):

> The members (of the executive committee) were of the opinion that the law of war should find no place in the relations of the American Republics with one another, as war would be—if Pan-Americanism is more than a word—little less than civil war. . . . The members of the executive committee and of the Institute present at Lima were therefore a unit in believing that only the law of peace should be considered, as peace should be, and in fact is, the normal state of affairs.

This is the OUTLAWRY OF WAR, so far as it goes at least, exactly as conceived by Mr. Levinson and advocated by Senator Borah! It falls short in the sense that it fails to rivet the structure of "the law of peace" with the wrought-iron bolts of a specific declaration that *war is a crime,* to be outlawed and punished as such. But even on this point, this new Code of International Law makes amazing advance in its "Project

No. 30," entitled "Conquest" (see pamphlet, page 118):

The American Republics...animated by the desire of preserving the peace and prosperity of the continent, for which it is indispensable that their mutual relations be based upon principles of justice and upon respect for law, solemnly declare as a fundamental concept of American international law that . . .

In the future territorial acquisitions obtained by means of war or under the menace of war or in presence of an armed force, to the detriment of any American Republic, shall not be lawful; and that

Consequently territorial acquisitions effected in the future by these means cannot be invoked as conferring title; and that

Those obtained in the future by such means shall be considered null in fact and in law.

Here, now, is Outlawry not talked about and dreamed about, but to a very considerable measure actually *achieved* in the present world! Here is the complete and perfect refutation of the charge that the Outlawry advocates are foolish idealists mooning over some vague fantasy of aeons hence! What we have in this actual codification of American international law is not a theory but a fact. It is the proof, in terms of reality, that the Outlawry program is not a Utopian dream but the one most practicable idea of statesmanship now before the world. The one question confronting the peace advocates of our time is the question, Do you really want to get rid of war? Are you ready to banish it from human society, outlaw it from the ways of men, destroy it root and branch? If so, here is the ax which will find the root of the tree. For what has been done for the nations of Pan-America, can be done even more completely for the nations of the world. Secretary Hughes is a pretty practical man—and it was he who saw, in his codification of American international law on the basis of "the law of peace," the open road to our goal. In his address, above referred to, he said (see pamphlet, page 3):

I believe that this day . . . marks a definite step in the progress of civilization and the promotion of peace, and for that reason will be long remembered. For in this effort we are not unmindful of the larger aspects of the question, and it is our hope that the American Republics by taking advantage of this opportunity may make a lasting contribution to the development of *universal* international law.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

[*Note*: The above editorial was written in the late days of the summer. Since that time, the Locarno agreements, outlawing war as between Germany and France, have been drawn up and are now before their respective nations for adoption. This is an answer to the charge of the impracticality of Outlawry so complete and final, that the charge must henceforth be silenced forever. If Germany and France can find it possible to outlaw war, other nations can easily follow suit. What we now see, in such facts as these, is the sudden demonstration of the fact that the Outlawry of War is the one most feasible as it surely is the one most effective program of peace now before the world.—J. H. H.]

Jottings

The Tenement House Commissioner of New York has admitted that his department has broken down. "Notices to landlords," he testifies, "to clean up their houses and make them habitable are flouted." The remedy for this situation, according to anti-Prohibition logic at least, is to disband the department and repeal the tenement house laws. If not, why not?

The ex-Crown Prince, Wilhelm Hohenzollern, has recently published a book entitled, *"Ich suche die Wahrheit!"* ("I Seek the Truth"). This is good news. If the Hohenzollerns are really seeking the truth, there is hope that the human race may not always be content with myths and legends.

Dr. Charles R. Brown, of Yale, came out strongly the other day in favor of compulsory chapel. The students responded by voting, in a referendum ballot, 8 to 1 against it. We vote with the students. Compulsory chapel is too much like prison chapel to do much good.

It is pleasant to record the placing of a memorial tablet on the house in New York long occupied by Robert G. Ingersoll. The generation which knew this great orator and spiritual emancipator is passing away, but his memory remains as green as ever. This is a sure sign of his immortality.

An Associated Press despatch states that France has lost 17,000 men killed and wounded, and has spent more than 3,000,000,000 francs in Morocco and Syria since she assumed the protectorate of the one and the mandate of the other. Is imperialism a paying business, we wonder?

The *News Bulletin* of the Foreign Policy Association in New York has discovered that the State Bank of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (Russia) has among its "New York correspondents" such well-known capitalistic institutions as the Guaranty Trust Company, the Equitable Trust Company, and the Bank of the United States. This looks to us like doing business with Russia. Yet the United States government doesn't know that Russia exists at all. The world marches right straight along, and Washington is as oblivious as the deaf and dumb mute in the asylum.

J. H. H.

Justice to Asia

A generation ago an occasional seer might have been heard to utter the unheeded prophecy "The Pacific is the world of the future." But in this age of immediacy visions have such a way of taking on reality overnight, that no one today wonders at finding the Pacific already dominant in the world of the present, though with the habit of international nearsightedness characteristic of Americans few of them sense it. Yet to an increasing degree the problems of the Pacific nations are assuming the leading role in the unfolding drama of human evolution. Four years ago the Washington Conference taught the Powers that the Pacific could make revolutionary history with a celerity quite in keeping with the speed of our airships, while at this very moment even so apparently innocent and frail a trifle as the Asiatic poppy is playing the part of monkey-wrench thrown into the delicate machinery of international relations. So it has come that race prejudice, the most ominous cloud threatening man's future, is growing blacker every day, rolls out its distant thunders and lurid with lightnings menaces the harmony of the entire human family.

The Pacific, the great ocean of romance, is in itself a term of rarely idealistic import. America, whose idealism was neither achieved by her own exertions nor thrust upon her by environment but born in her perforce through her British heredity, showed only her most idealistic side to the Pacific world for decades after she broke into that vast waste of waters. She promptly converted the semi-savage people of not a few of its scattered islands and in Hawaii graduated the first newly Christianized modern nation. She made square treaties with China and Japan, fostered their popular aspirations, returned to them Shimonoseki and Peking indemnities, generously poured upon them schools and colleges and universities, and led these, the two hoariest monarchies on earth, into the garden of the gods of modernism as a child might guide grandparents into a rosary. Even today she is finding it impossible to break this habit of friendly treatment.

This attitude toward nations, upon whom Europe consistently and roughly expended her will to exploit, was in perfect keeping with the idealistic bent of the great peoples of Asia—of India, the home of philosophy, cradle of religions and exponent of simple living, of China, where the soldier is last and the scholar first in the social scale and local self-government has attained its highest development, of Japan, which deifies courtesy, honor, loyalty and has cultivated individuality (not personality) like no other people on the planet, and now of Russia, with her passion for art, literature, music and the drama, busy testing out the first utopia ever subjected on this globe to the hot fires of large scale experimentation. Yet with all their inherent idealism three of these peoples, Chinese, Japanese and Americans, have evolved the most realistic civilizations in Pacific history and Russia bids fair to make this trio into a quartet. Meantime virgin resources of vast uncalculated extent lure them on to mightier achievement. What will crystalize out of this intermingling of Asiatics who industrially are the most highly evolved group in the human family, of Russians, perhaps the most virile of present day stocks, and of Americans, richest and commercially most powerful of modern peoples?

II

Up to within a few years America by her idealistic treatment of the Far East had stirred in the peoples of Asia the passion of international friendship to a degree thus far unknown in man's story; but the era of marvelous expansion which began after the civil war proved to be niggardly soil for the cultivation of the spiritual values so highly prized by our forefathers. The nation began slowly to scrap her idealism and in the eighties finally passed a Chinese exclusion law. It was the first exhibition of that careless flouting of the sensibilities of Asiatic peoples which has come to complicate so unpleasantly our nation's transpacific relationships. Again and again in seasons of calamity America tried to sugar the bitter legislative pill handed out to the Far East with gifts of money, but dollars never did or could function as a substitute for ideals. Finally this rough-housing of international courtesies culminated in the exclusion clause of the Immigration Bill of 1924 and convinced the peoples of Asia that the great Republic on the eastern shore of the Pacific in reality cared little or nothing for the finer feelings of her neighbors to the west. The blow fell with crushing force upon Japan because of her well-earned position as one of the seven leading world Powers.

Ever since the first showing in 1906 of America's offishness Japan had spared no pains to adapt herself to our whims. Was it exclusion of her workingmen we wanted? She would and did rigorously keep them from coming here. Did our nationals wish to acquire land in Japan? She granted foreigners the right of land ownership by their corporations and of land leasing for 999 years by individuals, and has just followed this up by giving aliens fee simple privileges. Was a hue and cry raised against dual citizenship by our professional stimulators of fear psychology? The Imperial Diet passed a bill, far ahead of European legislation, which excludes from the Empire's citizenship her nationals born in America, except on express request to the contrary. But this policy of deference to our wishes has dulled not one whit American Japanophobia. It only served to whet it. After each blow delivered by the California legislature and by the Supreme Court in its decisions concerning "ineligibility to naturalization" Americans of well attested friendship hastened to convince Japan that these anti-racial manifestations did not represent the heart of our Republic, but on each occasion just when the Japanese had accepted these apologies as true, another knockout blow to her self respect and honor would fall. And every concession Japan made was followed by a fresh American insult.

When therefore the exclusion clause was passed and the President put his signature to it, pillorying the people of the Far East as more undesirable than the least civilized of Europe, the Japanese were cut to the quick. What this meant has been better stated by no one than by our Ambassador at the time in Tokyo, Hon. Cyrus E. Woods, at the memorable meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at Washington last December.

The Japanese Exclusion Act was, in my judgment, an international disaster of the first magnitude,—a disaster to American diplomacy in the Far East, a disaster to American business, a disaster to religion and to the effective work of our American Churches in Japan. Japan cannot fail to turn for her international fellowship, co-operation and inspiration toward those

nations and governments which regard her honor, dignity and self respect, and away from us, unless we change our manner and our law.

III

Nothing is more significant of the fact that a new era in world affairs began with the Washington Conference of 1921 than Japan's reaction to this exclusion insult so wantonly and discourteously given by our Government. With one voice from the highest to the lowest, in protest meetings, in editorials of yellow press and of high-brow journals, though the spirit and the manner of America's action were stigmatized with uncompromising adjectives, the nation, with exceptions so few and uninfluential as to justify the word unanimously, declared that a warlike solution of the problem raised by the exclusion clause was unthinkable, that inasmuch as the United States had perpetrated the offense without provocation and without a shadow of justice the atonement must rest with our Republic alone, that as the author of the insult the harm done was not to Japan but to America's character and reputation and that the Empire would follow Jesus' precept and turn the other cheek. Nothing nobler in the realm of international relations ever brightened the pages of history. The highest tribute to the character of our nation that any neighbor Power has ever paid has been the confidence expressed again and again since last June by Japan's leading publicists that the American conscience and love of justice may be trusted to blot from her statute books the discriminatory enactments which since 1913 have blackened the pages of our State and Federal legislative records.

A scene which marked the opening of the Japanese Diet last January most dramatically pictured this new spirit in modern international life. Baron Shidehara, the Foreign Minister, delivering his message to his nation finally reached the question of American-Japanese relations. In a voice trembling with emotion he said,

> It is evident that the two nations should live in cordial friendship for all time and co-operate with each other in the great mission of promoting the peace and security of the Pacific regions and of the world. With regard to the discriminatory clause against Japanese in the immigration act of the United States of 1924 the question still remains unsettled. The continuance of discussions between the two Governments at this time will not serve any useful purpose. What is really important is that the American people shall come to have a correct understanding of our people and points of view. There is no doubt that the same love of justice that kindled American independence still continues to inspire the minds of American people. The day will come when this fact will be fully demonstrated.

As the statesman's voice thrilled the packed chamber and its echoes died away a solemn silence pervaded the assembly and in that tense moment of exaltation the determined will of Japan to peace and goodwill stood revealed in full power.

Since the enactment of the exclusion clause the swing of the pendulum in America and Japan has been toward extremes. We have become distinctly more militaristic and our neighbor Power more pacific. To sketch our side as the Far East sees it one need only recall the belligerent speeches of the Secretary of the Navy, culminating in his notorious "cold steel" threat to Japan, the farce of "Mobilization Day" last September, the vote in Congress to augment our armament of war cruisers and the naval demonstration in Hawaiian and Australian waters. Like Bunyan's Giant Pope, America seems futilely shaking her armed fist at Japan, whose coolness and wisdom in reciprocating with nothing but actions that spell "It takes two to make a quarrel and we do not propose to play the part of one of the two" are exhibiting our nation in a rather Falstaffian role to both contemporary and subsequent history.

IV

Meantime the internal fight in Japan against militarism is presenting on the world stage one of the happiest of present day dramas. Moved by the R.O.T.C. adjunct to some of our colleges and universities, Japanese militarists recently resolved to force training in "mass murder" upon her higher schools. With the immediateness and full force of the law "reaction equals action" the youth of the Empire organized the National Federation of Students Opposing Military Training and issued a declaration to the effect that it is

> a shame for the students of Japan meekly to submit to a scheme devoid of high ideals, a scheme which is in effect no more than a system of training for scientific murder, especially dangerous at the present time when the American people are filled with martial ardor and are looking for, although perhaps unconsciously, a chance to show their strength in arms. The rising generation of Japan cannot afford to entertain the world with fire and the blood of the nation's sons. . . . merely to humor the caprice of a limited section of the militarists who have not progressed with civilization's march.

Men like Hon. Yukio Ozaki, the leading liberal statesman of the Empire, Toyohiko Kagawa, at once both Christian Socialist and the greatest single human force in the Far East and Kiroku Hayashi, President of Keio University, backed by a host of teachers and a vast body of the people, are championing the cause of these idealistic youth who constitute Japan's noblest challenge to the young people of America to come out unequivocally against war, against all preparations therefor and on behalf of the repeal of all our racially discriminatory legislation.

Typical of this movement for permanent peace in Japan stand forth the utterances of two of the nation's progressive leaders, first President Hayashi's ringing words

> I cannot accept the encouragement of military training on the basis that other nations of the world are extremely nationalistic and militant. I have a firm conviction that the general tendency in world affairs is toward peace. Any bellicose operation or preparation for war is altogether opposed to the spirit of the times;

and second Mr. Ozaki's fulmination

> Too much of the art of murder is taught in the schools. It is not good to train a nation's boyhood to kill.

To get a clear view of the overwhelming anti-war will of Japan it is only necessary to offset our Naval Secretary's utterances with the following statement made last December by Admiral Takarabe, Minister of the Japanese Navy, in voicing his nation's hope that a Conference for further reduction of armaments might soon be called by the United States:

> Japan is ready to consider a proposal for the further reduction of armament. The best bulwark of peace would be the impossibility of aggression and this should be made to depend not only on the human will but on the technical impossibility of practical warfare. It is the highest duty of the statesmen of both America and Japan to uphold the sacred cause of peace and combat by all means possible the insidious campaign aiming at the destruction of public welfare for no other reason than the promotion of militarism. Peace loving American citizens and peace loving Japanese subjects should rally firmly so that there shall be no gap of which trouble breeders may take advantage. The Pacific should be preserved to eternal peace among the nations washed by its waves. The American and Japanese public should be convinced that there are no issues whatsoever between the two nations awaiting solution by the application of brute force.

One cannot read these fine words without cherishing the hope that the great Empire of the Western Pacific may ere long resolve to follow Denmark and scrap as

worse than useless its armaments, reduce its army to mere police requirements and help the world to take another long stride toward permanent peacefulness.

Place beside this significant movement in Japan the quiet deep revolution in progress throughout India under Gandhi, the supreme prophet and statesman of our day, whose program of non-violence is the sublimest response to the call of Jesus our world just now can show. Add to this the remarkable manifestation of loyalty to truth by the youth of China and by her Christian leaders. Wherever the white race is in the ascendant its recreancy to the teaching of the Galilean is startlingly in evidence. Is the East turning to Jesus? Is the West turning away from Jesus? What great nation has just published its will to continue debauching mankind with opium, because her monetary interests demand it? Not Japan nor China. Thank God, America's skirts are clean here. But when it comes to denial of brotherhood and the will to uphold that denial with force it seems to the Eastern Asiatic that it is America's turn to plead guilty. It was one of China's most gifted young men who recently wrote to Sherwood Eddy that because of Christianity's attitude toward war he had been compelled by his conscience to resign as a Christian and take refuge in Buddhism, the religion of peace. Aye, and it was Viscount Shibusawa, a Confucian, who said last year to an American Christian layman, "My religion does not permit me to retaliate against the United States by a boycott."

V

The "non-Christian" world today is voicing to our nation the greatest international challenge in the realm of ideals ever issued. Since 1914 dryrot has been attacking the very heart of our free institutions. Are we losing our democracy at the very moment when the Far East is carving out its own Governments of, by and for the people? Fancy Japan with its newly won manhood suffrage side by side with the refusal to ballot by some one-half of our qualified citizens in a most important presidential election, notwithstanding the extraordinary effort last fall of religious, social, commercial and political organizations to call every voter to the polls. After painstakingly laboring to open and keep open the door in China and Japan, are we closing our own portals and dreaming of selfish isolation? Like the ostrich with head safe in the sand are we shutting our ports with exclusion laws and tariffs while the whole sky above us is being unroofed to absolutely unregulatable traffic? What are we doing to prepare for the era of unclosable doors? All past history is offering us the altruistic leadership of the world. Are we spurning it? Does Europe love us in our refusal to do our part to heal the wounds of the smitten peoples, while we dicker over debts which we might forgive with a spirit that would unravel the tangle of reparations and chase off the planet all future war preparations? Does South America look upon us with friendship in view of what seems to its nations the insatiable appetite of our financial interests to dominate the entire continent? Is the Far East in its swing away from militarism toward brotherhood the only great potential friend left to us?

How then about that latest appeal to America's fear psychology, the treaties of friendship between Russia and China and Japan? Have we here a new yellow peril? No war peril certainly, for these races have made up their minds that international warfare is not only a curse but the extreme of folly and for them unthinkable if possible to avoid. There is no menace to peace in the getting together of these three Powers. Are we also soon to see India with her doctrine of non-violence join them? But even though there be no threat of war in this epochal drawing together of Asia's peoples, a foresquare entente of China, India, Japan and Russia would surely modify America's and Britain's material dominance. What will the outcome be if we remain the bulwark of acquisitive society, while Russia with her communistic republics, China with socialism making daily gains, and Japan, solicited to turn from exploiting capitalism to co-operation between the twin sources of wealth, are being fitted by high heaven to forge to the front simply because they are pre-arranging their social system to function in the coming era of industrial brotherhood? Would not a solidarity of friendship between Asia and America condition most healthfully such tendencies?

What about a consistent policy of Pan Pacific-ism? For years our Government has been coquetting with the ideal of Pan Americanism. Much of the time we have seemed and have been sincere in fostering it. But excellent as it is and worthy of every effort to realize it, the Pan American goal cannot compare in importance with the unification of the peoples who live about the North Pacific Ocean. Here are the largest independent populations dwelling in their own territories which contain the richest unexploited resources on the planet. The manpower and mineral power and agricultural possibilities and unharnessed water power of Russia, China, Japan and America exceed calculation. Despite our policy toward the Soviet Government and our present attitude toward the Mongolian peoples it needs but a gesture of real friendship on our part to blot out from their minds the memory of our brusque treatment and to establish with them an international relationship of ideal harmony and permanence. Is it not worth some sacrifice to secure this incomparable end? Does the world today need anything so much as this blend of the idealism of the Far East and of America to turn the scale in Europe from dependence upon disruptive physical force to reliance upon the Public Opinion of Mankind as the supreme unifying sanction?

The only people in our country who can solve aright the problems involved in these questions are the men and women who, whether called Christian or not, whether numbered within or without the membership of our churches, are earnestly seeking to embody in their lives and in the social whole the ideal of Jesus—bona fide brotherliness. The call of the hour is for this remnant in our nation to unite and begin to end the nightmare of racial exclusiveness, race prejudice and race hatred, which is drowning out the nobleness of our people. It needs no political party behind it. It calls for no vast propaganda to engineer the new day in America. The first step, and it is an incalculably onward stride, is to recover our age-long friendship with Asia by sweeping all discriminatory legislation from our statute books. We need not touch our immigration law or the exclusion clause. By passing a federal statute providing that

> All aliens, legally residing in the United States, shall be equally eligible to naturalization

we can transform that vast continent into a community of devoted friends. Such a law would deliver our nation from the danger of groups of aliens who though living permanently among us are kept by our own laws

out of sympathy with ourselves and our institutions and who are now a source of trouble because of that fatal discriminatory designation "ineligible to naturalization." To pass such a law would be the acme both of justice to Asia and of health for our own body politic.

DOREMUS SCUDDER.

At the Grave of Morel

Edmund Dene Morel was, as a matter of fact, not buried. Lovers of freedom and admirers of Morel's heroic faithfulness will make their way, not to the cemetery, but directly across the road therefrom to the well-appointed crematorium. His characteristic courage and willingness to be different, and his habitual obedience to the commands of truth, make it particularly appropriate that his body should have been committed to the purifying power of the flames.

The cemetery and the crematorium are but six-minutes' walk from the Golders Green Station of the London Underground Railway and we may note an appropriateness in the fact that, a few blocks further up Finchly Road, one comes to the entrance of Hampstead Garden Suburb, the most interesting and successful attempt in the world to apply the principle of democratic control to city home-building and community life. To this principle of control in national and international affairs, E. D. Morel devoted his unusual talents.

A plain panel of the cloistered wall of the principal building in the Crematorium group, is set apart to the memory of this prophet of the modern troubled world. Attached to the panel is a wreathed tablet on which there is inscribed the brief and simple legend:—

In Memory of
Edmund Dene Morel
Vindicator of Freedom
For the Natives of the Congo
Champion of Peace
Amid the Passions of War.
Born July 1873
Of French and English Parents.
Died Nov. 12, 1924.

Pregnantly eloquent are the words, the more so because of their simplicity and freedom from all cant. When I was told a few days later: "We did not spend much on the memorial, believing that E. D. M. (he was ever familiarly so spoken of) would have preferred that the funds be used in promoting those causes to which he had devoted his life," a new radiance shone from the simple memorial.

With uncovered head the writer stood before this tablet while in memory he surveyed the wonderful story of achievement and of heroic character which the legend so briefly told. In the Congo, as by accident, while engaged in a business enterprise, Morel came upon sad and unsuspected human conditions which his humanitarian heart would not allow him to pass by. Exact and full information he searched out persistently, and when this was attained, it left him no choice but to resign business and give his all to free these suffering natives. Speaking in season and out, publishing article after article and book after book, presenting assured facts, he succeeded in arousing the public opinion of the civilized world to such a point that the powerful interests were forced to yield and the slaves were set free. It is not strange that this is acclaimed as the greatest achievement of modern times. Then came the war, and with the war the frenzied mind that distorted all vision. The blinded and false patriotism, intolerant of one who dared to be different, sought to make the hero of the Congo appear as the enemy of poor trampled Belgium, and then to find means of bringing about his arrest as an enemy of the Realm. Occasion was found in a technical and unwitting violation of the postal laws, and he who was shortly before crowned as a hero and savior of humanity, was now cast into prison, where he was kept for six months, and where was undoubtedly laid the foundation of his death. But after the release from prison, he took up the battle anew and twice did the people send him by large majorities to represent them in parliament. There he served his chosen ends with courage and power, until the broken physical organism gave way, bringing to a close a day of glorious achievement.

It is the record of a great and thrilling career. And in it there is a convincing and inspiring illustration of the timeless quality of life. Morel's worth to the world is not measured in any way by the number of days he lived; whether few or many does not matter; but rather is it known by the quality of the deeds which he wrought, and the purposes he served. In heroic devotion to truth he first gave up business that he might serve a cause of human freedom, upon which he had come by accident; and then in obedience to the same voice, he became the "Champion of Peace amid the passions of war." In the rare and precious quality which led him to humble himself and become obedient even unto the end, we can see Morel's life in its true significance.

Life is timeless. Morel is not dead but lives more truly than ever before. In the office where his personality is sorely missed and in the council-room where words of courage and wisdom were always expected from him, no spirit of discouragement is discernible. Those who have taken up his responsibilities in the work of *Foreign Affairs,* 34 Queen Victoria Street, London, are under no illusion concerning the difficulties of the task. Miss Stella Morel, whose character and skill gave her a trusted place at her Father's right hand, is compelled to leave the office out of considerations of health and for an indefinite time to be among the hills. But her comrades are assured that her devotion to the work will bring her into the struggle again as soon as strength will permit. The present Editor of the paper, Mrs. H. M. Swanwick, is by no means a novice at the task she faces. Her books, "Women in War" and "Builders of Peace" reveal her comprehensive and accurate knowledge of her field of work, and her clear vision and keen insight into the ways of peoples. She sets herself to her new duties with quiet and determined purpose. The enterprise has, too, the support of strong and fearless men, like Norman Angell and Mr. Charles Trevelyan, who will not fail it in time of need. Likewise, the Union of Democratic Control misses its leader greatly, but it also is not cast down. Without signs of discouragement it goes steadily on its way, patiently disseminating truth, encouraging and correlating scattered forces, knowing that in time the people who

suffer and who pay will demand also the control of that which determines their destinies. So the work goes forward; the worker has fallen, but those who remain at the task, and those who have but begun, look confidently to the time when the truth shall prevail.

The record of this life can but bring every man who reads it thoughtfully to gird himself anew for the fight of truth against error, of right against wrong, of light against darkness. He goes forth armed with renewed assurance that life is actually timeless; that it may well become a part of that which endures forever. With heart strengthened, with faith assured, we may turn from the memorial at Golders Green, repeating the words of Morel, the true warrior: "Death does not stop us. Truth and justice will prevail."

Oxford, England. HARRY FOSTER BURNS.

ANNECY

Lost in misty cloud-lands,
  Mountains of the sea,
Bathed in purple beauty,
  Lovely Annecy!

Resting in sweet waters,
  Clad in mellow blue;
Now you change your garments
  As I worship you.

Sitting there in silence
  With the clouds on high,
Catching all their shadows
  As they wander by;

At your feet the waters
  Slip and glide and gleam,
And your chiffoned shadows
  Hold me in a dream.

Drifting, floating, dreaming,
  While I worship thee,
Voice of heavenly stillness,
  Lovely Annecy!

Poem writ in sapphire
  With a sail afloat,
Penciling your stories
  From its mirrored boat!

Lovely mountain fastness,
  Take my heart to thee!
Lovely mirrored mountains
  By Lake Annecy!

G. F. S.

THE STUDY TABLE

Some New Books

The presence in our country of fully eight thousand college and university students and more than six thousand students in secondary schools, who have come here for study from foreign lands, is surely a significant fact. It means much for us, for these men and women, for the lands from which they come, for international relations. The Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. are awake to the practical importance of the matter. Both maintain a Friendly Relations Committee, the purpose of which is adequately suggested by the name. The book before us[1] is a study of a survey that has been directed by these committees. Their attitude is shown by this statement:

> These students are men of exceptional courage and intelligence or they would not be here. They remain in our country for several years. When they return to their homelands they have unusual opportunities for influence and leadership. They are a potential asset or liability to the Christian cause and the movement for international understanding and good will. It is of the utmost importance, both for their nations and for ours, that they return to their homes with an adequate comprehension and appraisal of the life and spirit of America, and especially that they come to understand the part that the spirit and teaching of Christ have had in building up the institutions and the life of our republic.

We have no desire to criticize or belittle the seriousness of the problem, nor the earnest efforts of the committees to meet it. If we *had,* we might begin by challenging the assumption that underlies the last lines of the quotation. The chapters making up the book are worked out with almost painful conscientiousness by workers of experience. The spirit shown is admirable. Many of the recommendations are kindly and put into operation will make the lot of many foreign students happier than they would otherwise be. We shall not take space to present them in detail. We hope the book will have a wide reading and will arouse many to interest themselves in these foreign students, to show them the best side of American life—*so far as possible stripped of coercive religious connection.* They deserve simple, direct, human treatment; they deserve recognition as equals; they deserve *respect* in their difference; they have a perfect right to retain their own viewpoint, their own belief even; they should not be subjected to constant assault and attempt at conversion. In the book we have a large employment of the questionnaire method of survey. It is admitted that many of the foreign students have made no reply to the questionnaires sent them. We are not justified in extending percentages based upon the questionnaires that are filled out to the group of foreign students as a whole. Even if the questionnaires turned in were genuine and honest, a fallacy would still remain in such an extension. The bulk of those who send in no replies should be added to those who send in hostile replies. Those who fail to report are either indifferent or hostile. Examining the questionnaires that are sent in, which are friendly and favorable, the Committees must know that there is a steady pressure on those who respond, to answer what is desired. To do otherwise is to lose caste, to forfeit interest, to ultimately be left outside. The "annual dinner" is made pleasant for the boy who can most touchingly acknowledge what is being done for him. Frequently the boy, who is found to have some ideas, whose own religious views are sacred to him, who is unwilling to attack what he finds around him but who does not enjoy hearing the faith of his father belittled—after a brief period of kindly and brotherly treatment, finds himself sidetracked, more lonely and abandoned than when he landed. I am not complaining; the thing is natural. Church kindness to the stranger wears out unless he joins the church; Christian Association interest wanes unless the foreign student takes part in the aggressive religious efforts. What the efforts are most interested in achieving is conversion and proselytism; one who proves refractory—though an able student, a gentleman, friendly and anxious for friends, is promptly dropped. In the replies and comments on them, we find that students who were here

[1] *The Foreign Student in America.* New York: 1925. Association Press. 8°. pp. ix. 329.

active Christians often backslide when they return home. Why not? They were what they were here because they had to play the hypocrite in order to get those things which they craved. The ideal situation, of course, would be for the foreign student to enjoy precisely the same privileges and opportunities that American students enjoy—to be welcome in the society, in the fraternity, in the club, in the pleasures, in the competitions, which the rest share. The American who is studying in college is not all the time bombarded by religion; the religious service is there, if he wants it. The Y. M. C. A. does not markedly discriminate between Christian and non-Christian American students. If *he* wants the Bible-class he joins it; he is not unwelcome in other activities, if he does not care for it. He is not driven to actual hypocrisy to retain privileges. Of course, we realize that the ideal condition is impossible. In this land of freedom and democracy, the foreign student at least must conform. He has a freer air in European schools. It was a Russian Jew, who complained bitterly years ago that his student life had narrowed with each move he had made to find greater freedom. He had freer thought and finer life in Russia than in London; more in London than in Chicago. As the ideal condition is little like to be sought here, especially for Oriental students, the kindly suggestions offered in the book, though based on selfish religious and political aims, deserves consideration.

Howard R. Driggs has shown real industry in ferreting out and organizing the materials for his *Pioneer Life Series*. Three new members are before us. In "The Bullwhacker"[2] we are given a vivid picture of a life and occupation now almost forgotten. Oxteaming to found a home was one thing; bull-whacking, transporting freight continually from an older center to a frontier post, was quite another. The man who was seeking a home in the far west, set out with family and belongings in the covered wagon on the *one* trip of his life; when it was done, it was done. But how many of us realize that there were regular lines of transport where freight of all kinds was teamed from Sidney or Cheyenne up to Red Cloud Agency and Fort Fetterman? Those times seem far away, but the man who tells the story, bridges in his own life the space between those primitive modes of transportation and the conveniences of today. William Francis Hooker, "bull-whacker" in the seventies, is today editor, in New York City, of the Erie Railroad Magazine! He was born in Wisconsin. He drifted west and went to bull-whacking. He took his first lesson at Cheyenne, making the trip to Fort Laramie. The heavily loaded wagons were drawn by from five to seven yoke of bulls. There were tricks in the trade. The life was hard, the men were rough, there were dangers from Indians and "bad men." The story is told in detail. Russell's book, *Hidden Heroes of the Rockies*,[3] is quite different from its predecessors. Those have been the reminiscences of one man, the author and actor in the story. This is a gathering together of the stories of many men, who have participated in the work of exploration and discovery in the mountain region. Moreover, Prof. Driggs seems to have taken a more active part in the authorship of this book, as he says that Russell and he have long been friends and have long co-operated in hunting for the materials it contains. The story is traced from the missionary expedition of Padre Velez de Escalante to the arrival of the Latter Day Saints at Salt Lake in June, 1847. It is for the most part the story of the fur trade, of the voyageur and trapper, of the passing of the Indian, of the struggle between England and the United States for the possession of the Northwest. But in the work of pioneering the seaman, too, has done his part. We have it in Rydell's "On Pacific Frontiers."[4] The author was a Swede, who deserted the navy of his native land and came to seek a living and adventure in the United States. His "pioneering" begins with the nineties. He served a rough period of trial on the Atlantic, rounded the Horn, and then from San Francisco as a center, tried his hand at almost everything from handling lumber and catching salmon to gold digging in the Klondike and "panning" on the beach at Nome. It was rough life, hard life and, on the whole, unprofitable. It forms, however, a part of the building of the nation. Rydell's adventures took him along the whole coast from Southern California to the Aleutian Islands, to Japanese and Siberian waters, to Hawaii and ultimately to the Philippines. The story will give the youngsters some idea of what our civilization has cost.

The Pioneer Series is supplementary reading for the grades, say from the fifth to the eighth. The *Animal Life Series* is aimed at younger readers. *White Sox*[5] is a number in it. It is a story of the reindeer in Alaska. Mr. Lapp has been engaged in educational work in Alaska: he was also superintendent of the reindeer herds. In this simple but pretty story, he aims to depict the life of the reindeer, introduction of which into that northern land has meant so much for the native population. White Sox is a young male reindeer faced with the serious problems of life. The story brings out the contrast between wild caribou and domesticated reindeer, hints at the origin of domestication,, pictures something of northern life, and—quite unobtrusively and naturally—deals with some deep-seated questions of ethics and behavior.

FREDERICK STARR.

SCHUMANN, OP. 12, NO. 3

Beauty tears the heart of me,
I who die tomorrow.
All earth's loveliness recites
A threnody of sorrow.

Oh, the mystery, the pain,
Of even a breath of song!
Why is Life so bitter short?
Why is Death so bitter long?

For UNITY. JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

ANSWER

The nomad of the desert, he alone
Reads right the riddle of the sphinx's face;
But he finds not the meaning in mute stone,
But in the wistful heart of all his race.
So we turn from this seeking in the sand
This searching of the sky for some decree,
And find in the fond touch of some dear hand
Our only answer to life's mystery.
One passes by whose very garments glow
With the white radiance of his great soul;
Our spirit reaches out to him, and, lo,
That touch of healing virtue makes us whole.
The stars go out; they give no guide, no mark—
Only man's love for man beats back the dark.

The Christian Register. *Hugh Robert Orr.*

---

[2] *The Bull-Whacker.* William Francis Hooker. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1924. World Book Co. 16°. pp. xi. 295.

[3] *Hidden Heroes of the Rockies.* Isaac K. Russell. Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co. 16°. pp. xi. 295.

[4] *On Pacific Frontiers.* Carl Rydell. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1924. World Book Co. 16°. pp. xiv. 267.

[5] *White Sox.* William T. Lapp. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1924. 16°. pp. vii. 76.

CORRESPONDENCE

BACK TO BARBARISM

(An Appeal to the Fundamentalists)

Dear UNITY:

The good old Heinrich Heine wanted us to believe that the great Lord has given us tongues that we may say something pleasant to our fellowmen. Desirable as it is, it takes a superman to hold to that idea in view of our *status quo*. But where is that child-like giant and superman! Our fathers lack the vitality; our mothers are too frail; our air is too dense. Hence we must speak the unpleasant!

Facing things as they are, with the world's manhood, womanhood and childhood struggling against the crushing onslaughts of a huge and demoralized industrial civilization, and a world's blind statesmanship as cruel, cunning and vicious as the savage of antiquity, one wonders whether the most orthodox optimism can dare hope to encounter with success Shaw's terse conviction and verdict "that the other planets use our earth as their lunatic asylum." In truth, where save in an unguarded lunatic asylum can we meet with such vile practices of degeneration, destruction and waste of precious wealth and lives as we see daily perpetrated upon the highways of our so-called civilized nations of a "superior" race—deeds of crime so shamelessley broadcasted by a conscienceless press? After nineteen centuries of arduous labor, of missionary work, crusading, social growth, political victories and an uninterrupted preaching of the gospel of brotherly love and peace, we have finally succeeded in transforming our globe into a huge slaughter house and in the training and bringing together the world's manhood for mutual and wholesale destruction, proud of the achievement of having in a brief period of four years poisoned and butchered in cold blood MILLIONS of the flower of the human race, sons of human mothers, children in the image of the supreme Father.

But the makers of human destinies and misery, the Christian statesmen of our so-called civilized nations of a "superior" race, do not seem to be pleased with the cauldron of destruction they and their immediate predecessors have wrought; they do not seem to feel remorse for their ignominious betrayal of the spirit of the Gospel and the part of Judas they had taken to their Master. Like an unruly pack of hungry beasts they thirst for more prey, more blood, and accordingly are found actively engaged in the perpetuation of present iniquities and for the repetition of past crimes, but on a much grander, more grotesque and gruesome scale.

Read the latest statement of the League of Nations (that is, the League of Selfish Plotters) as heralded by the press. Ponder over its significance. Then tremble over the enormous criminal possibilities its context foretells.

Seven years after the world celebrated the first Armistice Day, winning the war "to make the world safe for democracy," we discover that the seventh anniversary of that great event will find the world feverishly perfected and ready for another colossal carnival of murder and destruction which only an asylum of unguarded madmen could harbor. We are informed that fifty-nine civilized nations have now in their military barracks six million fifty-five thousand one hundred and forty-four (6,055,144) picked men, well dressed, fed, armed, trained and ready to obey the commands of their superior madmen and, with the benedictions of the Cross, fall upon innocent mankind and pile ruins upon ruins of the world's treasures. The chemists, well subsidized by the authorities of states, are nervously intent upon the production of the most deadly gases to poison the lungs of their fellowmen. Battleships and submarines are being added to hasten human death upon the seas, while great workshops are decking the blue heavens above with sky-monsters whose foul breath sounds annihilation to mankind. Thus was the world made safe for bragging nationalism and rampant militarism.

> "Admittedly to all the world, the last war settled nothing, removed no menaces; apparently it only multiplied dangers to be provided against. None of the explosions of the last war have been powerful enough to blow governments out of the old deep militarist ruts, and we are back to 1900 or 1906, consulting the same oracles, resorting to the same remedies, and provoking the same fate."

Here it is where we stand, as summarized by the first Labor Prime minister of England, the man who stood closest to the front in the days of trial.

At this momentous crisis confronting the human race, in these troubled days that test individual character and national integrity, in this age of vital doings and undoings, where do our "Fundamentalists" and guardians of public morals stand? How do they propose to halt mankind's march Back to Barbarism? Our "Fundamentalists" are out crusading for the sanctity of the Bible, for the protection of the morals of our youth, and for the general safety of home and country. Well and good. But why pick and sound trumpets at trivialities and ritual and dodge vital realities? Somehow, we do not hear them thundering against the political, industrial and militaristic iniquities of the day which burden the country, play havoc in our homes, corrupt our young, let alone mocking the sanctity of the Bible. Why not adhere to the *fundamentals* of the Holy Writ and move battle from the immaterial and hypothetical descriptions to the basic and creative admonitions of Chapters 20, Exodus and St. Matthews 5, 6 and 7?

There is a wide-spread campaign to militarize our schools. Militarism means not only to train for the murder of one's fellowmen, but also to steal and to lie, as our recent experiences in the World War have demonstrated on such a gigantic scale. Chapter 20 of Exodus expressly says Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Why don't we hear our well-meaning "Fundamentalists" wage battle upon these clear issues and fundamentals of the Bible? Why don't they crusade against the militarization of our college campuses and the goose-step drilling of an unsuspecting youth, and thus truly vindicate the sanctity of the Book and safeguard the morals of our young?

The ethics of our industrial life is based upon the great lie that man is a commodity; and accordingly human lives have been neglected and brutally mistreated. Annually, thousands of workers lose their health and lives due to preventable causes. As many and more mothers are tortured and losing their lives for lack of means and knowledge withheld by a sophisticated ruling minority. Multitudes of wanted and unwanted babies are entering daily this world with no security save the comforts of a whimsical chance. And referring to the very same beings Chapter 2, Genesis states that "God created man in His own image." Why do not our "Fundamentalists" crusade for the image of the Lord, for the reorganization and humanization of our industrial life, thus truly fulfilling the laws of the Book? Is there a better and surer way to happiness than the road to a universal industrial democracy where men *work to create, and not merely serve to exist?*

The political life of the nation and the world at large is seething with "special interests,"—the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many. Each tries to take and to hold as much as he can, offering in return as less little as possible. Now, the Holy Book has something concrete on this matter. The last of the Ten Commandments unmistakably legislates *not to covet* anything that is thy neighbor's, while the whole Sermon on the Mount is a passionate plea for forgiveness, mercy, love and service. As yet we have not heard of a Mr. Bryan leading the "Fundamentalists" in a great campaign to end all national and international selfishenss and war, thus fulfilling the letter and the spirit of the Bible; instead, they are found battling windmills, ignoring the essentials of the very book they profess to revere in outward form. As to the religious world—the Shekinah has turned away from them; vanishing, in search for a more devoted knighthood.

But these are not days for idle bickerings. We must be wise, generous, willing to learn and ready for work. It is this attitude that is most needed in the days to come, for the good yet to be done; if we are to emerge from the pit of destruction towards which our statesmen are determinedly setting the nations of the world. "Now is the time for all good men and true to come to the aid of mankind." The Bible is a treasure of inspiration and strength if men dare to accept its fundamentals. Will men dare to read them and embrace them—understand them, fight for them and, if necessary, make sacrifices for them? Will our "Fundamentalists" be brave and honest enough to meet the challenge of the Book which they claim is their dearest possession?

Charles Darwin, the mortal, died and is well and buried; and the same fate will overtake us living mortals. But there are certain fundamental truths left by the man Darwin which can never die, so long as they retain the light of Reason. And the efforts of those fighting these truths with the methods of obsolete orthodoxy will be deemed by posterity as another futile attempt of a Don Quixote battling the winds.

The Bible is a physical book of a spiritual life and struggle containing in its pages truths which neither the logical elucidations of a Darwin nor the atheism of a money-mad world can demolish. And if our "Fundamentalists" are in real earnest

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

SHOULD SHE GO TO SAN QUENTIN?

Miss Whitney's Case in Brief

San Francisco, Oct. 26.—If Charlotte Anita Whitney hadn't visited the slums of east side New York City years ago she wouldn't be today at the gates of San Quentin prison.

Instead she would have followed the obvious course that was before her, a life of society.

* * *

Niece of United States Supreme Justice Stephen J. Field, daughter of a pioneer San Francisco lawyer and wealthy family, Wellesley graduate, settlement worker, suffrage leader and California's leading woman reformer—this is Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, whom the United States Supreme Court has decided must go to San Quentin for violation of the war-time criminal syndicalism law of California.

"It was as a settlement worker in the college settlement in New York that I first became interested in the poor," Miss Whitney tells. She is a slender woman in early forties, honest-eyed, gentle and utterly fearless. She has refused to ask for a pardon, although her friends are demanding one. Quietly she is making preparations for joining some 60 women felons in quarters in San Quentin penitentiary.

* * *

"It was the appalling poverty of the slums that changed my whole course in life," she continues. "I suppose I would have gone on being a society woman if it hadn't been for that experience."

Miss Whitney went in for suffrage and acted, with Jane Addams, as one of the vice presidents of the national suffrage organizations. Coming back to California she became organizer and first president of the California Branch of the Association of University Women, and for seven years she left her wealthy home to act as secretary of the Oakland Associated Charities. Branching away a bit from these activities, Miss Whitney led a reform fight that abolished the famous Emeryville race-track and gambling ring, and led a campaign that won the Red Light Abatement act which abolished segregated districts of vice. She was also active in prohibition, helped the cause of Irish freedom and opposed militarism. One of her most important victories was the compulsory physical education law for schools.

* * *

In 1915 she became a Socialist. In 1920 the Oakland Socialist party joined the Communist Labor party. This organization lasted ten days—but long enough for Miss Whitney to be arrested under the state criminal syndicalism law. Convicted and sentenced to serve from one to fourteen years, she appealed.

The case has gone from court to court, finally reaching the Supreme court where her conviction was just recently upheld.

Miss Whitney must go to prison, is the court's order.

* * *

"No, I'll not ask for a pardon," she declares. "I do not want a pardon for having had opinions. I'll go to prison."

Daughter of wealth and distinction, herself a prominent and famous individual, Miss Whitney will go behind the stone walls of San Quentin penitentiary and be given a number—unless something unforeseen comes to liberate her.

* * *

If you feel outraged at the treatment which is being accorded Miss Whitney let your protest find vent in the following ways:

1. Pass this leaflet on to others.
2. Write Gov. Friend W. Richardson, Sacramento, Calif., urging an immediate pardon for Miss Whitney.
3. Get organizations to which you may belong to pass strong resolutions demanding her pardon, send them in to the governor, and have them published in your local papers.
4. Send a contribution to the undersigned to help on the campaign in behalf of Miss Whitney.

American Civil Liberties Union,
So. Calif. Branch, 506 Tajo Bldg.,
Los Angeles, California.

SOME MORE ITEMS ON RECONSTRUCTION AT ARCHANGELSKOYE ESTATE NO. 4

Joe Broecker, who knows more about tractors than the man who invented them, added the figures of tractor accomplishment up for us one day. They may interest you, even if you are not a farmer. In black and white these are the figures: A total of 3,797 acres plowed. Then it was necessary to go over the whole nearly three times again with the discs to pulverize and pack, so that the weeds might be kept down and the moisture retained. This was another of 9,140 acres covered. Then again nearly four times over the whole plowed area with drags for further preparation of the soil, totalling 12,217 acres. Of this total acreage, 2,960 acres are in excellent condition for sowing fall wheat the middle of this month. With a little more plowing we shall have ready another 1,000 acres for spring grains. This is two and one-half times the acreage under cultivation for similar purposes last year, on this estate.

The tractors were used to cut 810 acres of grain on the estate and threshed 32,000 bushels. And then, when our own threshing was done, the peasants came to us and said, "Bring your fine machinery and help us. We have the best crops in years but much of it will be lost if we are not given aid in the threshing." So, George and Otto hitched the Case tractors to the Case threshers and sallied out to attack the hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat lying stacked and waiting to feed the world. Russia will undoubtedly export millions of bushels this year. A peasant family with one horse can thresh 25 bushels per day; two such families with one of our threshing outfits are threshing about 650 bushels per day.

These figures are not given to us with boasting, but invariably with the stories

---

ANITA WHITNEY*

Aye! send her to San Quentin's hell,
This woman nobly bred;
Give her a prison garb and cell,
And shame her honored head.
She dared to think! she dared to plead
The poor man's cause today!
She dared to challenge graft and greed!
Away with her! away!

She, who was born of gentle blood,
Went with the common herd.
She, who wore college gown and hood,
Spoke out an honest word.
She turned from fashion's heartless swell
To walk the Christ-man's way;
Off with her to San Quentin's hell!
Away with her! away!

For now our own Jane Addams waits
Shackles and prison van:
And goes through gray San Quentin's gates
Because she spoke for man.

More stupid than the German staff,
Who shot the brave Cavell,
We bid our bravest woman quaff
San Quentin's cup of hell.

Go, let the thieves and grafters out,
And let the murderers kill!
And let the money-magnates flout
All decencies at will!
What are our courts for but to tell
The getters to get more?
And railroad to San Quentin's hell
Plain workmen by the score?

Even the ancient gods awake,
And flock from regions vague,
To bring us drought and fire and quake,
And pestilence and plague.
The whole world mocks our falling fame,
And scornful nations tell
The depths of California's shame;
Deep as San Quentin's hell.

—*Robert Whitaker.*

*See "The Field" in this issue.

---

and honestly desirous to vindicate the greatness of the Scriptures and protect the morals of youth as well as the general well-being of our commonwealth, they can best achieve that by a united front; fighting for the abolition of militarism in our schools; for an intelligent and practical industrial democracy in our industrial life; and for general amicable relations at home and abroad, with an uncompromising outlawry of the employment of force of any kind in human relationships—all of which are fully vindicated in the pages of the Bible.

The world is headed in rapid strides back to barbarism. Misunderstandings, fears, jealousies, hatreds, hunger, ferment, civil and international strife, the outcome of which can promise nothing but disaster. Who will stem the ominous tide?

New York City. David Gittleman.

of what might have been done with more tractors and the absolute necessity for plenty of binders for the next harvest.

Of course, all this work could not have been done by our little group of pioneers alone. Not the least wonderful thing that has been done was the taking of the peasant boys from the plow and putting them on the tractors. Every one of our ten tractors now has a Russian driver. The entire battery of six working at No. 7, including the directing mechanic, is Russian. Some of these boys have taken the tractor in hand after two weeks of practical instruction.

Needless to say, the Old Timers were glad to see the rest of the gang come in. Ware, with the Borders family and Hannah Pickering, dribbled through by way of Germany and Moscow the first of August. The Stephens, Smith consignment, bringing doctor, teacher, dairyman, carpenter, mechanics and social worker, were washed in by the Black Sea after two weeks' wait in Constantinople and countless stops at Russian ports, without casualties and top-side up. Preparations had been made for a bang-up reception for them on Monday. Unfortunately, they came on Sunday and—had telegraphed instead of writing! All of the "family," save two, had gone off in the Dodge truck, our only motor vehicle up to that time, to our flealess and mosquitoless, children's colony and week-end resort at No. 7. How the group got in from the station a mile away is a story all its own. And the Maxim Gorky mixed—very much mixed—train that brought them five hours over the last sixty miles of the journey on schedule time, that too, is another story. They are here. The children are all safely out of the mosquitoes with doctor, teacher and helpers. The rest are housed and happy.

Three of the social workers of the group have undertaken a survey of our district of Archangelskoye, looking particularly into the educational, medical and agricultural conditions. Everywhere we have met with the utmost courtesy and helpfulness on the part of the officials and the people in general. A teachers convention is planning to visit us within the next few weeks. We have been asked by the Agricultural Department to bring some of our machinery to a Harvest Festival which will be held at Archangelskoye the middle of next month, when they plan to have a pageant of ancient and modern agricultural implements. Our educational opportunities are thus coming to us almost unsought.

Tell all our friends that we have found more and better things than we had expected and that everybody is happy.

Most sincerely,
DONALD STEPHENS,
For the Entire Staff.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren St., CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!

Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.

Insist on

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Subscribe for and read UNITY

224

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM DOMESTIC COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

NOVEMBER

With its brisk, wintry touches, suggests that your furs be at once conditioned for their season of heavy usage. Delicate, skilled and dependable are the processes by which we brush, cleanse, sanitize and prolong the life of the fur garments you entrust us with.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS MAIN OFFICE AND WORK
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue